



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT STUDIES OF THE PSALMS

There is no book in the Old Testament at the same time easier and more difficult to interpret than the Psalms. While anyone can appreciate their beauty and understand in a general way their meaning, and while almost anyone who studies them sympathetically can contribute something either to their interpretation or their application, there is yet no book with regard to which the commentators are so hopelessly at variance—whether as to the authorship and date of composition of the Psalter as a whole or of the different minor psalters and individual psalms of which it is composed, or as to the origin and first purpose of the Psalms, their meters and metrical systems, the method of their rendering, the interpretation of individual passages and even the determination of text. The reason of this is not far to seek. Many of the psalms have sung themselves through the lives and experiences of a generation of generations, and in doing so absorbed into themselves continually new experiences, new allusions, new turns of phraseology and thought. This has resulted in the introduction into one and the same psalm of divergent views and doctrines. Sometimes in the process of development the larger part of the original poem has been eliminated; always there have been changes of language and readaptations of allusions and references. As a result of this long use of the older psalms, individual experiences and personal references have tended to lose their individuality and personality and become collective in fact through the addition of new experiences and allusions, although still retaining the personal form. And on the other hand, the existence of such psalms, as a result of their origin, individualistic and personal in form but collective in fact, has led the composers of other later hymns, in their original intent, national or congregational, to cast their compositions in the personal form. The result of all this is that one interpreter sees the earmarks of one period or locality and another of another; one perceives the personal, another the national or congregational element; one sees one sense and is blinded to another, and vice versa; and the form is as elusive as the substance. The subjective element plays a large part in all art, poetry, music, painting, sculpture. Beyond and above all rules there is a question of sensation which cannot be defined. Consequently there is always a great divergence of view with regard to the quality and method of poetry. What one age approves another disapproves. What one nation loves is not attractive to the ear or the thought sense of another nation. That which charms the sense of the few does not appeal to the ear or the intelligence of the many. It is doubly difficult to criticize the poetry of a distant age and an alien people and feel oneself with genuine sympathy into its metrical and artistic forms.

For forty years, Professor Briggs tells us in various places, he has labored on the Psalms, and especially he has devoted himself to the question of their metrical composition. We have in this volume¹ the final result of these studies and an opportunity to test his theories of Hebrew poetry in their application to the Psalter as a whole. To many scholars this will seem the most interesting and most important part of these volumes. There is no doubt that Professor Briggs has made important contributions to the study of Hebrew meter, and, through that, to the correction of the text of individual psalms; but while this is true, we are compelled to say that we do not believe that the general consensus of students of Hebrew poetry will bear him out, in the long run, in his cut-and-dried calculations of tone and measure. He is essentially a critic, not a poet. He seems to have developed a theory of what Hebrew poetry should be, and with this before him to have criticized the actual poetry of the Psalms. Stretching each psalm in its turn on the Procrustean bed of his trimeters, pentameters, and hexameters, he has not only excised words which would not fit his measure, but has mercilessly cut off whole verses, or transposed the members, thus producing a machine-like evenness which will scarcely appeal to those who have loved the Psalms for the charm of their quaint and varied rhythm. The sense he has treated like the sound; and as for the text—he has made it conform to the exigencies of his metrical system, with the result that few or none of the Psalms remain unchanged, and some are almost unrecognizable. These very serious textual changes are based almost entirely on his judgment of metrical or sometimes of sense requirements, and with the object of restoring the text of the original Psalms.

It is much to be regretted, in our judgment, that he did not translate each psalm substantially as it exists in its final form, and then analyze it into what he believes to have been its original component parts. We should then have had the Psalms to begin with, and could have taken or rejected as much of Professor Briggs's emended psalms as the evidence presented might commend to our judgment. A very desirable check, also, which Professor Briggs does not give us, is the actual text of his emended psalms. We have in fact in these volumes, not the Psalms, but Professor Briggs's theory of the original psalms which lay behind the Psalms, and these theoretical original psalms are represented to us, not in the original, but only in translation.

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms.* [The International Critical Commentary.] By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., D.Litt., and Emilie Grace Briggs, B.D. New York: Scribners, 1906. 2 vols. cx+422 and 572 pages. \$3 each.

Professor Briggs realizes more fully, we believe, than any of his predecessors, the extremely composite character of the Psalms, and his study of psalm composition and development is on that account especially interesting; but it seems to us that he has failed oftentimes to reach the root of the matter, and to recognize the fragmentary character of the really original material preserved in those composite psalms. He sees, or emphasizes, in fact only one period of the development of the psalm, and that often not the earliest. Let us take, for instance, Ps. 89, which he divides into three original psalms, transposing certain verses in order to accomplish that result. The first part, or Psalm A, consists, according to him, of vss. 2, 3, and 6-15, with a liturgical addition, vss. 16, 17. This psalm was not earlier than the late Persian period, considerably post-dating the second psalm, B, which consists in his division of vss. 18-22, vss. 4 and 5, and vss. 23-46. Now, in the first psalm, A, we have, following Professor Briggs' translation, this verse;

North and south thou didst create them;
Tabor and Hermon in thy name ring out joy.

The point of this parallelism Professor Briggs fails to appreciate, his comment on the passage being: "The chief mountain peaks of the Holy Land, Tabor, commanding the great plain of Esdraelon, and Hermon, the giant of Lebanon, commanding the greater part of the entire land, representatives therefore of the mountains." But in point of fact Tabor and Hermon are the parallels of north and south in reverse order. If a poet or an orator of our own time were to say: "From north to south, from the Gulf to the Great Lakes," we should have no doubt whatever that he was neither a Russian nor a Frenchman nor even an Englishman, but an American. We should be sure, also, that he did not live in the times of the Roman republic, but since the creation of the American commonwealth. The same is true of this allusion. There is only one region in all the world where a poet could have written those words, and that is Galilee, because there and there alone do Hermon and Tabor mark north and south. They are the two conspicuous mountains which one notices from every point, and to which one involuntarily turns as landmarks: Hermon, the giant of the mountains, always visible, towering high above the landscape northward, and Tabor, not a mountain of great height, but, on account of its peculiar form and isolated position, the one conspicuous southern landmark. No one who has lived or even traveled much in Palestine could for one instant mistake this reference, and this reference, by fixing the locality of origin, carries the date of this verse back to a very much earlier period than that assigned to the psalm by Professor Briggs.

In his comment on the first stanza of Ps. 80, Professor Briggs points out that the Psalms of Asaph exhibit a peculiar interest in the people of northern Israel. Throughout that Psalter Jacob is prominent, and in certain parts, notably in the more primitive sections of Pss. 77, 78, 80, and 81, Joseph and the tribes of Joseph occupy the poet's mind. We have also in these psalms, as Professor Briggs has himself pointed out, certain peculiar phrases, such as "Shepherd of Israel," "He leadeth like a flock," which appear elsewhere only in the Elohistic narrative in the Book of Genesis, and certain expressions and turns of thought which connect themselves with the north-Israelitish literature contained in the early historical books. It seems to us that the only rational explanation of these phenomena is that these psalms go back in their origin to northern Israel, and particularly to the realm of Joseph.

In the Korahite Psalter we have even more exact references to north-Israelitish localities. Like almost all modern commentators, Professor Briggs recognizes that the local references in Ps. 42 connect that psalm with the region of Dan and the sources of the Jordan. He explains this connection thus:

The internal evidence points to a Levitical singer who had been accustomed to share in the festival processions in the holy places at Jerusalem, 42:5; who was especially at home in the region of the upper Jordan and Mount Hermon, 42:7. . . . He seems to have been one of the earlier exiles, before the destruction of Jerusalem, one of the companions of Jehoiachin. (Vol. I, p. 367.)

But what an unnatural and extraordinary explanation of the evident connection of this psalm with that locality! Why should Jehoiachin, and those who were exiled with him, have tramped up to the foot of Mt. Hermon? And supposing they had done so, is it likely that a "Levitical singer" from Jerusalem would have sung about the temple feasts at Jerusalem in the terminology of the quondam temple of Dan?

The allusions to Hermon and the hill of Mizar or the little hill, and to the fountains of the Jordan, are indeed unmistakable, as are also the allusions to ritual processions connected with religious festivals. This psalm, as all agree, has undergone repeated change and enlargement, finally receiving a whole new stanza, Ps. 43, and an elaborate chorus or refrain. The Jerusalem references belong to some of these later recensions or additions. The references to the region of the sources of the Jordan belong to the primitive psalm, which it is quite impossible to restore in detail. These references are sufficient, however, to show the origin and purpose of that psalm: namely, that it was a ritual hymn composed in connection with the worship of the temple at Dan, which stood by the greatest of the sources of

the Jordan, the most wonderful fountain in the world, where deep calls to deep and the noise of the water courses is deafening, and where, also, there was a levitical priesthood descended from Moses.

There is almost as clear a reference to the same region in Ps. 46, which, strangely enough, Professor Briggs connects with an earthquake at Haifa, or some place in that neighborhood, between Mt. Carmel and the sea. (What, by the way, could a temple singer from Jerusalem have been doing in that heathen country?) Whoever visits Dan and Banias and that immediate neighborhood at the foot of Mt. Hermon, where, with a deafening roar, the Jordan springs full grown from the waters under the earth, cannot fail to feel the local force of the description of the mountains that totter in the heart of the sea, the waters that roar and foam, the hills that shake with the swelling of the same, and the river whose brooks make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacle of Elyon.

If, following the indications of these references, we regard the psalms of the Asaphite and Korahite Psalters as having their origins in northern Israel, we obtain a satisfactory explanation of the use of Elohim in the middle books of the Psalter. The same influences which tended to cause the use of Elohim as the name of God in the Israelite narrative in Genesis, and which perpetuated that use, even after that narrative had been carried over into Judaea and incorporated with the Judaean narrative, led to the use of Elohim in the second and third books of the Psalter, in contrast with the Yahawistic use of the first, fourth, and fifth books. I may add that I believe the first part of Ps. 89 to have been originally Elohistic, inasmuch as by substituting Elohim for Yahaweh we obtain that assonance which seems to have been part of the poem and which is lost in those verses where Yahaweh is used.

In his comments on the first part of Ps. 19, the sun hymn, Professor Briggs suggests the possibility that it may have had its origin in a shrine of Shamash. We think that the suggestion is a fertile one, and that in point of fact not a few of the older hymns which were afterward worked over into their present form as hymns of the Jerusalem temple in the Persian or Greek periods go back in their origin to different shrines and earlier occasions.

The same lack of appreciation of the value of local references which we have noted in Professor Briggs' treatment of the Korah and Asaph Psalters makes itself felt also in other parts of this commentary, and especially in the treatment of the Pilgrim Psalter, Pss. 120-34. Not a few of these psalms contain allusions to the desert march from Babylonia to Jerusalem. This is the meaning of the reference to Meshech in Ps. 120, which Professor Briggs throws out because he supposes the psalm to have been composed

by someone familiar with the Nejeb, south of Judah. It is the conditions of the approach from Babylonia also which occasion those frequent references to the hills on which Jerusalem stands, in such striking contrast with the plain of Babylonia and the dreary plateau one must traverse on the journey. Some of these psalms fairly quiver with the apprehension of the dangers of the desert, which the ordinary traveler experiences on this journey, the unseen foes of every sort, man and beast, the mysteries of nature, so alien to the life of the city dweller. Here are reflected precisely those fears which fill the mind of the city traveler of today traversing the region between Baghdad and the Mediterranean and which, according to the book of Ezra, appalled the priestly lawgiver and his comrades on their journey to Jerusalem. You see the camp fires; you share the anxiety about the watch; you experience the treachery and hostility of the Arabs who are for war when you would give them the greeting of peace; you feel the heat of the sun by day and the cold of the moon by night, those extremes of daily temperature which bring discomfort and even danger to every traveler through that region. To him who has traversed that route it seems almost impossible that anyone should fail to perceive the origin and inspiration of the poems of this Psalter. And the language of these psalms supports this view, several of them showing pronounced Babylonianisms. But if Professor Briggs has failed to appreciate the exact origin of this charming collection, the nearest approach to folk-song in the Psalter, we have at least no quarrel with the period to which he assigns them. They could not have come into existence until the temple at Jerusalem had become the goal of pilgrimage for the pious Jews of Babylonia; and while those pilgrimages began before the time of Nehemiah, they certainly did not become a general practice until after his restoration of Jerusalem.

Here we may add, not as a criticism on these volumes in particular, but rather as a criticism on Bible commentaries in general, that the best results cannot be obtained by closet scholarship alone. Linguistic and philological study and study of the cognate languages and religions must be supplemented by personal acquaintance with the land as it is today, and some familiarity with the results of archaeological research. What has been done for Greek and Latin scholarship by the schools of archaeology at Athens and Rome it is equally necessary to do for Hebrew scholarship. We must supplement the home study in our seminaries, colleges, and universities by a course of training in Palestine before we shall obtain that combination of expert closet scholarship with archaeological research and personal touch with the country, which is requisite for a proper interpretation of the books of the Old Testament.

Space will not permit extended comment in detail, but to one or two minor points we desire to call attention. Professor Briggs has failed, we believe, to apprehend the original intent of such penitential psalms, as Pss. 6, 13, 38, and 51. They are to be compared with the Babylonian penitential psalms. They were liturgical in their original intent, a part of the ritual for freeing a man from sickness and calamity resulting from unwitting sins, the sacrificial prescriptions for which ritual are contained in Lev., chaps. 4 and 5, or from bewitchment and the like. The foes of these psalms, in their original conception, were, as in the case of the Babylonian penitential psalms, sometimes the evil spirits which have possessed the sufferer, sometimes those enemies who by their machinations and charms have caused the evil spirits to enter into the man, bringing upon him sickness and calamity. In their origin this class of psalms goes back to an early period.

Professor Briggs is too anxious to refer psalms to some particular historical occasion, and especially to assume their composition by or for some king or other great man. So, for example, he refers Ps. 45 to King Jehu of Israel. It is in point of fact precisely what it calls itself: a marriage hymn. Each bridegroom is the king and each bride the queen, as in the songs contained in Canticles.

We believe that Professor Briggs is right in laying emphasis on the titles of the psalms in determining connection and date, but we do not think that he is happy in the particular titles which he has selected for this purpose. It is the actual collections of "Psalms of David," "Prayers of David Son of Jesse," "Psalms of the Sons of Korah," and the like, which are helpful in this connection, not the musical titles out of which Professor Briggs has created his *Director's Psalm Book*, his collections of *maskils*, *miktams*, etc. In the large the Psalms are chronologically arranged, representing a gradual growth of collection added to collection; at least to this extent: that the earlier psalms are all to be found in Books I, II, and III, and that the connection of psalms as to date and locality is in general to be determined by their relation in the collections in which they now stand, not by their musical assignments, which belong to a somewhat later arrangement affecting their temple use.

Professor Briggs's discussion of the musical and liturgical titles is interesting, and we suppose that there are few who will not accept as satisfactory his general explanation of *selah*, as indicating the place at which the selection might be closed, or the end of a stanza or a section, and as indicating also that a benediction should be sung at this place; except that we are inclined to think that *selah* does not necessarily indicate that the selection might end at that point, but rather that at that point an antiphon, benedic-

tion, or interlude might be sung. In his comment on Ps. 3 Professor Briggs has failed to note what appears to be a confirmation in the text of this view. The *selah* divides this psalm into three stanzas, the first two of equal length, the third a little more than double the length of either of the two preceding. In the middle of this latter stanza, into vs. 8, break the words: "Arise, Yahaweh; save me, oh my God!" which disturb the meter and which Professor Briggs, on that account, throws out. But these words come exactly at the point where the third *selah* should have been. They are, in our judgment, the equivalent of that *selah*, and give us an indication of the sort of thing that was sung where *selah* is written in the Hebrew text.

Professor Briggs's interpretation of some of the other musical terms, *maskil* and *miktam*, does not seem to us satisfying. Is it possible that the use of *maskil* at the close of Ps. 47:8 may throw some light on the liturgical sense and purpose of this word? The preceding verse reads:

Praise God, praise Him,
Praise our King, praise Him.

Then comes our verse, as follows:

For God is King of all the earth,
Praise *maskil*!

Now praise "*maskil*" is metrically an imperfect, if not an impossible verse; and it gives, moreover, no satisfactory sense. It would seem as though what is needed after the last "praise" were a repetition of the chorus:

Praise God, praise Him,
Praise our King, praise Him.

as though, in other words, *maskil* were here a technical term to indicate a repetition, without writing out in full the words to be repeated.

Professor Briggs's interpretation of the general psalm title, *tehillim*, also seems to us to lack something. This word is the same as the Arabic *tahlel*, sacrificial praise song, and marks the purpose of the Psalter in its final collection as the ritual song-book of the second temple.

Numerous and serious as these criticisms seem to be, we would not wish it to be understood that our attitude is one of condemnation or even of unfriendly criticism. The work is interesting and valuable to the advanced student, just because of its speculations and theories, like the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, but for exactly the same reason it is not a book to be commended to the uninitiated as an authoritative interpretation of the Psalter.

JOHN P. PETERS

ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH
New York

As we read Dr. Thirtle's book² the disposition grows upon us to query whether it is to be taken seriously, or whether a sense of humor is required for its understanding. It is to be presumed that the former is in accord with the author's purpose, and in that light it will be considered.

The title is a misnomer; it would be more in harmony with the contents to call it "Hezekiah, the Central Figure in Hebrew Literature;" for the whole Psalter, Isaiah, and Job are considered the products of the king's pen, or of the men of his court. It may be said here that our author gives the titles in the Psalms and in Isaiah an authority not often accorded them in modern works on the Bible; and that he quotes all parts of the Bible as of equal evidential value. The book is divided into three sections, which will be considered in order.

I. *The Pilgrim Songs*, or as Thirtle insists they must be called, *Songs of the Degrees*.—This is certainly one of the most interesting collections in the Psalter, and one which has not yet received any generally accepted interpretation. It is, however, agreed that the collection once existed by itself with the title, "Songs of the Going-up," and that it is post-exilic. Dr. Thirtle examines the various theories that the title comes from the stairlike parallelism, that the songs were sung on the temple steps, that they were songs of the returning exiles, or of the pilgrims going up to keep the feasts, and he pronounces them all unsatisfactory. In his constructive work he lays stress on the fact that there are just fifteen songs, and that the correct title, to which great weight must be given, is "a song of *the degrees*."³ The fifteen songs correspond to the fifteen years added to Hezekiah's life after his seemingly fatal sickness. The degrees or steps refer to the return of the shadow on the steps or dial of Ahaz, the sign by which Isaiah confirmed his promise of the king's recovery. It is unfortunate that the shadow did not return fifteen degrees, but here stress is laid on the name, not on the number. The idea thus suggested is confirmed by reference to the writing of Hezekiah, the genuineness of which our author confidently assumes, in which the king says:

Therefore we will sing my songs with stringed instruments
All the days of our life in the house of Jehovah (Isa. 38:20).

Hezekiah's time is deemed one of great literary activity, a fact established by the statement that the "men of Hezekiah copied out Proverbs of Solomon" (Prov. 25:1).

² *Old Testament Problems: Critical Studies in the Psalms and Isaiah*. By James William Thirtle, LL.D., Member of the Royal Asiatic Society. London: Frowde, 1907. 336 pages. \$2.40.

³ If a literal rendering is to be pressed, as the author does, then we must translate—"the song of the degrees."

Four of these songs have a Davidic title (122, 124, 131, 133), and one a Solomonic (127). That authorship is accepted for these, but it is held that they were adapted to Hezekiah's age by changes in the text. The other songs were written by the king, or by his literary circle.

Dr. Thirtle takes each psalm and explains it in the light of his theory. But a single specimen can find place here. Pss. 127 and 128 are very pronounced against race suicide. Our author holds that Hezekiah had no children, was probably unmarried at the time of his sickness, since fifteen years later Manasseh came to the throne at the age of twelve years. The occasion of the Psalms is therefore obvious.

II. *The Formation of the Psalter*.—The thesis of this part of the book is that the Psalter in its present form was compiled and in large part composed by Hezekiah. All the psalms with Davidic titles were composed by the famous poet-king, but they were modified by his greater successor to suit the needs of the temple service. We have here, therefore, not so many fugitive poems, but rather a single document continuously written. This remarkable hypothesis is supported, among other things, by quotations from parts of Isaiah which are certainly exilic or later. Here again one specimen of the author's "critical studies" must find place. Take Ps. 137. It was written in Jerusalem (vss. 5, 6) but still it refers to an exile, but an exile in Babylon in the time of Hezekiah. Now Sennacherib was king of Babylon as well as of Assyria. He captured many Judean cities and carried off 200,150 prisoners, many of whom were sent to Babylon to replace the peoples transported to Samaria. These facts afford a suitable Hezekian background for the poem.

III. *King Hezekiah in the Book of Isaiah*.—It is assumed as certain that the whole book was written by the son of Amoz. Since Ahaz is named in 14:28, and since Isaiah wrote in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and *Hezekiah*, it follows that cc. 15–66 all belong to the time of the last-mentioned king. Wherever there is a reference to an exile, it is that referred to above. This theory is worked out in great detail, but it will suffice to call attention to a few points.

The Servant of Jehovah is the good king Hezekiah. Isa., chap. 53, is explained as being occasioned by the king's sickness, in this book made the most famous illness in history. The nature of the disease from which the king suffered is easily determined from the treatment, a cake of figs. It was *elephantiasis*, the most terrible form of leprosy. That diagnosis explains some of the expressions like "his visage was so marred more than any man" (52:14). The discovery of one fact often solves other problems. The author notes that Job had long years before suffered from the same

disease. The book of Job was written by Isaiah to console the righteous sufferer, and to convince the king that in the end he would be more blessed than at the beginning.

One recalls the fact that Cyrus is named in Isa., chaps. 44 f. No problem is too hard for our author, and here he deserves commendation for ingenuity. In chap. 44 we have the words "smith" and "carpenter," part of which in Hebrew is חֲרֵשׁ (Harash). חָרֵשׁ would be artificer. That was the word which stood originally in the text and referred to Hezekiah. That word afterward was changed to בְּרִשׁוֹן, to adapt the passage to post-exilic conditions.

The book is interesting and in many places ingenious; but the criticism is generally fanciful and frequently absurd.

L. W. BATTEEN

ST. MARK'S CHURCH
New York

This book on the text of the Greek Psalter⁴ is part second of *Septuaginta-Studien* edited by Professor Alfred Rahlfs. Part I (1904) contained *Studien zu den Königsbüchern*. Professor Rahlfs shows himself skilled in textual criticism. So far as the Psalter is concerned, he builds on, but seeks to advance beyond, the labors of Swete, Holmes and Parsons, Lagarde, Klostermann, von Soden, etc., on the Septuagint text. Of course, a book of 256 pages could not be exhaustive in dealing with the text of the Psalter.

In chap. i he sets before us the materials for the Septuagint text of the Psalter—the uncials and cursives, naming three uncials, L, B, and S, as belonging to the fourth century. He names some small fragments from the third and fourth centuries which he urges should be used in making the next critical edition of the Psalter. He emphasizes Lpz¹⁷⁰ which Heinrici dates from the beginning of the third century and which contains Ps. 118:27–58. As to minuscules, he adds only a few points to Holmes and Parsons' and Swete's collations. He regards MS 294 as a cursive, not an uncial, as do HP and Lagarde. He mentions several cursives that have come to light since HP's collation—two are known with precision, Lpg^v and Rom¹²⁰⁹. As to versions he names Lat, Sah, Boh, Eth, Gall, Arm, Syr, Pal, and Arab with their MS witnesses.

In chaps. 2, 3, and 4, he considers MSS under two great types of text, B and G^{Vulg} (Vulgar text), thus really following Baethgen, though differing in nomenclature. He examines 129 characteristic readings and gives the relation of various MSS, versions, and Fathers to these two types of text.

⁴ *Septuaginta-Studien*. 2. Heft. Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907. 256 pages. M. 8.

Boh is nearest to B, Eth coming next. A is mixed, fluctuating between B and G^{vulg}, which proves that the latter must have existed as early as the fifth century A. D. After dealing with corrections and mixed readings, he concludes that B and the Vulgar text have influenced each other, though the tendency is to force B back into its own region, since even Boh, closely related to B, is in some MSS corrected according to the Vulgar text.

As to the relation of the Latin Psalter to the two main types, he concludes that MSS Carn, Corb, Germ, H, and R incline more to B, while Med, Moz, Rom agree more with the Vulgar text, and so, since the Latin text generally agrees with B, we may regard Carn, Corb, Germ, H, and R as Old Latin texts, while the remaining MSS are late. As to the Fathers, Hilary and Ambrosius used mixed texts; Jerome, though making three Psalters (Rom, Gall, Heb), did not follow, in his quotations, any one of them, but often went back to the Greek text; Augustine quotes different Latin texts, sometimes going back to the Greek, though R and Gall are the usual text-forms in Augustine. Professor Rahlfs dissents from Vallarsi's view that R is a recension by Augustine. His general conclusion is that the Latin Fathers did not use a uniform type of text.

Professor Rahlfs makes an interesting general conclusion as to the relation to B and G^{vulg}, of MSS, versions and Fathers: of 170 witnesses tested, 18 incline rather to B, 9 have 50 to 25 per cent. B-readings, the rest agree with G^{vulg}, with little or no B-mixture. As to time, early revisers (except Jerome in Lat Rom) follow B, but late ones entirely G^{vulg}. As to place B-texts belong to Egypt and the West, while the original home of G^{vulg} is uncertain. After the seventh century G^{vulg} prevails in the East and West. He divides B into Oä (Upper Egypt), Uä (Lower Egypt), and Western types.

In chap. v the relation of the hexaplaric text to other texts is considered, concluding that Gall is an uncertain witness for the hexaplaric text, and that the text of Syr is not hexaplaric; that the Vulgar text agrees with the hexaplaric text in only a few exceptional cases; so the general conclusion is that either Origen made as base of his hexaplaric text, a text closely akin to Oä and Uä, or Oä and Uä are strongly influenced by the recension of Origen.

As to the peculiar readings in Oä and observations on Eastern versions (chaps. 6 and 7) there is much detail work, but there are no striking conclusions. In chaps. 8, 9, and 10 Professor Rahlfs seems too sanguine as to his conclusions on recensions as based on quotations from the Fathers. Theodoret follows G^{vulg}, though Chrysostom is the chief witness of G^{vulg}, and so it presents the recension of Lucian. Cyril of Alexandria agrees more with Uä than with G^{vulg} and in Uä we see the recension of Hesychius. Justin agrees largely with G^{vulg}, though Uä, Oä, and Western readings

occur. Irenaeus agrees strikingly with the Latin Psalter. Clement of Alexandria largely follows G^{vulg} .

In chaps. 11, 12, and 13 Origen is shown to vacillate between $U^{\ddot{a}}$, $O^{\ddot{a}}$, Western, and G^{vulg} texts. "In $O^{\ddot{a}}$ we have a pre-Origen unrevised Septuagint text." This is a little misleading, but he modifies it by adding that $O^{\ddot{a}}$ is not the original text, but has received Christian changes and additions. Lat, chief representative of Western text, represents also a pre-Origen text though Lat and $O^{\ddot{a}}$ differ among themselves. Hesychius had the same prehexaplaric text that Origen had and revised it only a little. Lucian's recension (of G^{vulg} type) supplanted Hesychius' recension in Greek-speaking lands and became the official text for Greek Christianity. In these last conclusions our author adds little, if anything, to Swete.

CHARLES B. WILLIAMS

Baylor University

Waco, Tex.

THE EPHRAIMITIC BOOK OF LEGENDS

It was a very happy idea of Dr. Procksch to make the Elohistic document of the Hexateuch the subject of an exhaustive monograph.¹ He gives first a translation with concise notes preceding each section, treating more fully only those points at which he has new proposals concerning the separation of J and E and especially concerning the strata within E itself. On the detailed apportionment of J and E there will always be room for differences of opinion. The various new proposals cannot be taken up here. Procksch is always acute and careful as may, e. g., be seen when he shows that Exod. 4:1-16, 27-31a, do not belong to J but to a later stratum in E. The value of this part consists in the able summary of the results of modern criticism. By means of the translation concreteness is given to E, and it is shown that E was really a book by itself with a definite plan, not merely a collection of fragments.

The second part of the book treats first of the Ephraimitic origin of E, its age (first half of the eighth century), and its prophetic character. The original work was composed by one author. Tracing then the inner history of E, Procksch characterizes the groundwork of E and discusses its original metrical form, following Sievers, but rightly insisting on the unity of the groundwork of E and denying the validity of the metrical argument, *unless reinforced*, for assuming several (Sievers: three) original metrical primary sources of E. Of the elements which have been incorporated into the

¹ *Das Nordhebräische Sagenbuch, die Elohimquelle übersetzt und erklärt.* Von Lic. Dr. O. Procksch, Privatdozent an der Universität Königsberg. Hinrichs: Leipzig, 1906. 394 pages. M. 13.50.